



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

a basis of five for form and five for substance. English received comparatively as much attention as the other subjects. Those poems were the rankest work I ever had.

[Fate is sometimes ironical. The above paper, undoubtedly the best in technique, was selected on the assumption that the writer was admitted on certificate. But inspection of the record shows that he took the examinations.]

—J. M. Hart.

Cornell University.

---

### Book Department.

THE FOUNDATION OF RHETORIC. By Adams Sherman Hill. New York : Harper & Bros. 1892.

Professor A. S. Hill of Harvard is the author of one of the best Rhetorics published in this country, and it is therefore especially interesting to examine this new book from his pen. The *Foundation of Rhetoric* is intended as a more elementary work than the *Principles* by the same author, and it therefore deals with the simplest points of good usage in writing and speaking. In accordance with this plan about two-thirds of the book is devoted to the use of words, the remaining third being divided between sentences and paragraphs, the latter receiving but slight attention. Throughout are copious examples both of correct and incorrect forms, with concise discussions of the points involved. As an example of the minute points discussed, Professor Hill treats under nouns the possessive case, plurals that may be misused, and words in *ess* and *ist*. He apologizes for the past on possessives by saying, that "the faulty sentences come from compositions written by candidates for admission to Harvard College." But certainly all teachers of rhetoric will justify this careful discussion of minute points, since these are the ones in which mistakes are most frequently made. In fact the best thing about Professor Hill's book is its practical rather than its theoretical character. The book thus reaches down into the realm of grammar, instead of carrying us into the regions of philosophy.

One thing we should have been glad to see emphasized more than has been done. Rhetorics usually fail to take into account the difference between spoken and written English, between the colloquial and literary dialects so to speak. That there is such a difference, both in choice of words and to some extent in constructions, it seems to me useless to deny. For example take the use of *who* for *whom* in "who did you see?" Is it not best to recognize in this a correct colloquial use of *who*, since it is so thoroughly established, than to try the impossible in rooting out the usage? Even Professor Hill, according to his own theory, should have recognized this use, since he recommends the adop-

tion of English usage when also found in America (p. 28), and the above use of *who* is English usage according to Sweet's *Spoken English* (p. 20). The same may be said of the use of *me* in "It's me," for which see Sweet's *New English Grammar* (p. 341). The purist is too often accustomed to take into account only the usage of books, while there is also a standard usage among good speakers.

There is another principle as to difficult points of usage which may be illustrated by a story. A very cautious man was once asked, "Which would you say; the public *is* cordially invited, or the public *are* cordially invited?" His answer was "I should say; a cordial invitation is extended to the public." This of course seems like dodging a point that should be settled by some reason for one or the other form. In reality the answer was based on a fundamental principle of good form. Often times either of two forms would at least suggest something besides the meaning intended, and the principle of encouraging and concentrating the reader's attention may demand giving up both forms for a third which is always possible to choose. This principle might certainly be applied to some of the discussions in Professor Hill's book, while in the main they are admirable. For instance, ought it not to be said of the possessive singular of nouns ending in *s*, that while careful writers usually add the apostrophe and *s*, they also commonly avoid the occurrence of such a possessive for the sake of euphony.

Exception might be taken to some statements in the book. For example; (p. 82) "'You *was*,' which is now a badge of vulgarity, was once good English," for which Horace Walpole is cited as an authority. Certainly the authority of Horace Walpole is hardly sufficient to establish *you was* as good English at any time and it is doubtful whether the occasional example cited by Fitz-Edward Hall can do so. Again on p. 92 it says: "*Proven* is borrowed from the Scotch legal dialect. In the case of Madeline Smith, who was tried for murder in Edinburgh in 1857, the verdict of the jury was 'not proven.' Since that time the word has often appeared in newspapers, in magazines, and often in books." The implication here is that the word was borrowed after 1857, while a reference to Webster shows that it was used by Thackeray at least before this.

Notwithstanding these criticisms, The plan of Professor Hill's book is admirable, and its careful discussion of so many points of usage will be particularly valuable to teachers in secondary schools.

—*Oliver Farrar Emerson.*